

Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for Education Resource Facility

*approved
S. E. comments*



18/3/08

A: AidWorks details *completed by Activity Manager*

Initiative Name:	Education Resource Facility		
AidWorks ID:	44706	Total Amount:	\$12 million
Start Date:	1 July 2008	End Date:	30 June 2010

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details *completed by Activity Manager*

Appraiser:	Final ratings agreed at Design Peer Review 120308
------------	---

Based on ratings provided by:

Chris Hoban, Heather Dornoch, Paul Tippet & Paula Henriksen.

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

Criteria	Rating (1-6) *	Explanation	Actions to improve
1. Clear objectives	4	Objectives are too input focused. It is not clear what success will look like. Ensure consistency between objectives and the outcomes in the logframe.	Rewrite objectives to be more outcome-focused.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	Add more success measures and reduce process measures in logframe. More information required about the data AusAID will require for monitoring and evaluation. Provide position description for the monitoring and evaluation expert including time allocation for the position.	Simplify logframe to have a few success related measures (delete process measures). <i>and for delete key success indicators for inclusion in logframe doc's</i> Draft and annex position description for the monitoring and evaluation expert.
3. Sustainability	4	The ERF will only be sustainable as long as it is funded. Within the contract period, effective implementation will generate the demand necessary to ensure sustainability. A comment on sustainability of the facility model based on the DFID experience will be useful.	Will include some lessons learned from DFID models re sustainability of resource centres in design.

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	<p>i) To inform bids need to clearly quantify the baseline of work that the ERF will be required to deliver.</p> <p>ii) Clarify the facility manager role and how bidders for this role will be evaluated.</p> <p>iii) Clarify role of Technical adviser.</p> <p>iv) Rationale for consortium not clear.</p>	<p>i) Spell out and quantify <u>baseline tasks</u> ERF will deliver.</p> <p>ii) Attach <u>position descriptions</u> for the Facility manager and management team including selection criteria.</p> <p>iii) Attach <u>position description</u> for Technical Adviser.</p> <p>iv) A single contractor or consortium will be able to bid for facility management role (assuming they meet criteria).</p>
5. Analysis and lessons	4	<p>i) Need more evidence to back up statement that AusAID requires more technical expertise than available in-house or through the education period offers.</p> <p>ii) More information for external bidders on AusAID staffing and education programs.</p> <p>iii) Provide more analysis of lessons learned (and potential problems) based on DFID experience.</p>	<p>More analysis of the shortcomings of the period offer and the lessons learned from DFID's resource centre experience will be included.</p> <p>More information on AusAID education programs will be included.</p>

* Definitions of the Rating Scale:

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

Next Steps

- *ETG to revise the ERF design in accordance with peer review comments and circulate for virtual comment;*
- *FMA9/10 and procurement method approval submitted week commencing 25 March 2008;*
- *ESG + Procurement to liaise on bidding document.*
- *Draft bidding documents to be circulated for virtual comment*

Andrew Laing

Manager, Economics and Service Delivery Branch

March 2008

APPROVED/NOT APPROVED